

# Guru Arjan Martyred by Shamanistic Law

KAPUR SINGH

THE Moghul Emperor Jahangir, in his diary, *Tozki Jahangiri*, wrote as follows about Guru Arjan:

“In Goindwal, which is situated on the banks of the river Beas, there lived a Hindu whose name was Arjan and who professed to be a religious teacher. Thus he acquired quite some fame in the country as an expounder of religion and many a simple-minded Hindu and also some ignorant Muslims admired his character and piety. They called him the Guru. From all directions crowds of people gathered around him and extolled him as a true teacher.

“This business had been going on for three or four generations. For a long time past it had been my intention to shut this shop of falsehood or, alternatively, to convert this man to a follower of Islam.

“During these days Khusrau happened to pass that way. This fool of a man (Arjan) entertained the

desire to seek the Prince's nearness. Khusrau happened to camp at the place where this man resided. He came and had an audience with the Prince and made certain communications to him. He made a mark of saffron on the Prince's forehead with his finger. This is called *qasqā* by the Hindus and is considered auspicious.

“When all this was reported to us, and when we became convinced that the man was a charlatan and a false prophet, we ordered that he should be brought into our presence. We further ordered that his immovable property, his sons and dependents should be handed over into the custody of Murtza Khan. We confiscated all his moveable property and belongings and we ordered that he should be dealt with in accordance with the penal laws of *yasā*. (*formūdām ki o rā ba-siyāsāt, ba-yasā va rasānand*)\*

---

\**Tozki Jahangiri*; Nawal Kishore Press; Lucknow; p.35 (Persian).

What is meant by this imperial command that Guru Arjan be dealt with in accordance with *yasā*?

The translators of Tozki Jahangiri and Sikh historians\* have rendered the word *yasā* into "torture" or "tortures." Thus, they have stated that *yasā* is a Turkish word which means torture, pain, physical torture, etc. These meanings have been given to *yasā* on the authority of Indian-Persian dictionaries. No attempt has been made to trace the word *yasā* to its origin.

It has not been considered that the word *yasā* originally belonged to the Mongol language and passed into Turkish. It has not been pointed out that the author of the Tozki Jahangiri was an emperor of the Mongol race and that the word *yasā* is the axis around which the whole concept and history of Mongol imperialism revolved. *Yasā*, therefore, must be given the meaning which a Mongol emperor would naturally have given it.

This mistake has led to the general belief that Emperor Jahangir's imperial command issued against Arjan was that Guru Arjan should be put to death by extreme tortures.

It is believed that this imperial command was issued to a government functionary, Murtza Khan by name, or, as the later Sikh historians state, to the imperial servant, Dewan Chandu Shah, who bore a domestic grudge against Guru Arjan and, as a consequence, the Guru was tortured to death at Lahore.

Before Sikh historians discovered this admission in the Tozki Jahangiri, it was common belief among the Sikhs that the sole responsibility for the martyrdom of Guru Arjan lay on the head of Dewan Chandu Shah and that the Moghul government had no hand, direct or indirect, in the perpetration of this crime.

Now it is clear that this wholly erroneous misconception did not prevail among historians of a later period. For Kesar Singh Chhibbar, the writer of the manuscript Bansavali Nameh, who was born to be a clerk in the household of Guru Gobind Singh at Anandpur, was quite clear in his mind that Guru Arjan was martyred by the Moghul government. He cryptically said, "*Kh* (i.e. a *khatri* or a *kṣatrīya*, to which caste the Gurus belonged) has been an enemy of the *kh* always. The kinsmen were

---

\*A Short History of the Sikhs by Teja Singh and Ganda Singh; Volume I; Orient Longmans; 1950; p.34. The authors translate the last line of this excerpt as follows: "I ordered,.....he should be put to death with tortures."

treacherous and the Moghuls were the enemies. No Hindu protested against and no Sikh punished the wrong-doers."

Thus Chhibbar openly alluded to Prithi Chand, Guru Ram Das' son, and the Moghul Emperor Jahangir as those responsible for the martyrdom of Guru Arjan. It would appear that for some reason at a later stage the aforementioned misconception was created and caused to prevail that the sole responsibility for the martyrdom of Guru Arjan was laid on the head of Dewan Chandu Shah.

When it was discovered that Emperor Jahangir, in his Tozki Jahangiri, unashamedly confessed that it was he who ordered that Guru Arjan be put to death, it was further naively accepted that the motive for this crime was the Emperor's religious bigotry and that an excuse to eliminate the Guru was then sought in the rebellion of Prince Khusrau and the Guru's marking the Prince's forehead with saffron.

Modern Sikh writers then endeavoured to show\* that in reality the Guru was in no way concerned with Prince Khusrau and his rebellion. All the Guru did was to feed Prince Khusrau and his hungry followers from the community kitchen and that

the Guru had no interest whatever either in the Prince's rebellion or the political background of his rebellion. The Moghul Emperor, so these modern Sikh historians like to believe, caused the death of the Guru on account of his religious bigotry and he used as an excuse the false allegation of the Guru's abetment of Prince Khusrau's rebellion.

When the facts are properly studied this does not appear to be the true position.

More than one argument can be advanced in support of this stand. Emperor Jahangir was an autocratic, sovereign king. Had it been his pleasure to cause Guru Arjan to be put to death for the crime of running "a false shop" of religion which caused the true believers, the Muslims, to go astray, there was no impediment in the Emperor's way whatsoever. To cause a true believer to go astray from the orthodox path of Islam and to lead him into heresy is, according to Muslim *shariat* (tradition), in itself such a grave crime that death is the only penalty for it in a government based on Islamic laws, such as the Moghul government in India undoubtedly was.

This crime of Guru Arjan's was admitted and about it there was no

---

\**Ibid.* p. 35.

dispute. Why did the Emperor not order Guru Arjan put to death at once and earlier, without painfully waiting for an opportunity to lay the false accusation of abetment of Prince Khusrau's rebellion at the Guru's door? Hindu or Sikh public opinion could not possibly have deterred him from this and it is obvious that the Muslim public opinion would have viewed such a meritorious act of their Emperor's with unqualified approbation.

It must further be conceded that when writing in his *Tozki Jahangiri* the Emperor was not indulging in what may be called propaganda, that is, distorting facts in self-defence. His diary was his personal property and was to remain in the Imperial library even after the Emperor's death and no question of making its contents public was ever to arise. What Jahangir wrote in his diary, therefore, was what he believed to be true. What he wrote represents what he knew or believed to be true at the time of writing it. From this conclusion there is no escape when the nature of the document and the circumstances in which it was prepared are properly understood.

That the Emperor himself may have been misled regarding the true facts is, however, always a possibility.

It would be improper to assume that Emperor Jahangir himself caused the false accusation to be laid against the Guru in order to bring about the Guru's death on political grounds and that he was motivated by his desire to remove a powerful opponent from the path of Islam in India. Such an assumption would be improper, not because the moral character of the Emperor was such as to preclude this assumption, not because the Emperor was incapable of countenancing a lie for political purposes, but because such a thing was wholly unnecessary. Neither political considerations nor the reasons of the state in any way made it necessary for the Emperor to await a chance event such as Prince Khusrau's rebellion before imposing capital punishment on Guru Arjan in pursuance of the declared religious policy of the state.

At the time of ascending the throne, Jahangir had firmly reasserted and declared the Islamic *ṣarīat* as the foundation of his government and had he ordered the death of Guru Arjan as soon as he had the first intimation and proof of the Guru's crime of leading a single Muslim astray from the path of true Islam, the Emperor would have gained merit in the eyes of his Muslim courtiers and subjects in this world and in the



eyes of the Prophet Mohammad in the next world. He could have done so just as his grandson, Emperor Aurangzeb, did when, without hesitation and without fear, he ordered the public decapitation of Guru Tegh Bahadur in Chandni Chowk, Delhi, at midday.

It is true that Emperor Jahangir in his Tozak confesses that he did not view with favour the ever-growing religious prestige of the Guru. He admits that he was waiting for an opportunity to shut this "shop of falsehood." It is clear, however, that for some reason of expediency or of state he did not want to declare open hostilities against the house of the Guru on the issue of Islamic *ṣari'at*. He therefore waited for an opportunity when he could take action against the Guru on purely political grounds.

As has been argued, it would not do to assume that the Emperor waited all this time for an opportunity to frame some false political accusation against the Guru. Had such been his intention, it becomes difficult to see why any waiting was necessary at all. Prithi Chand or the bigoted *mullās* and Muslims residing in the neighbourhood of Goindwal would have willingly come forward to oblige the Emperor by

deposing against the Guru. It therefore must be conceded that the insinuation that the Emperor wanted some false political accusation to be made and substantiated against the Guru but that he was obliged to wait for the fulfilment of his desire till Prince Khusrau rebelled, is wholly farfetched.

Two broad conclusions seem to follow: (a) The Emperor Jahangir did not want Guru Arjan to be put to death in accordance with the Islamic laws of *ṣari'at*, not because Guru Arjan was not liable to be put to death but for some other reason of expediency or state, possibly because it had not yet been finally decided that Islamic *ṣari'at* was to be the sole and only basis of the Moghul government in India. (b) Jahangir was quite clear in his mind that the activities of Guru Arjan were of such a nature that sooner or later the Guru was bound to fall afoul of the political laws of the state, apart from the laws of the Islamic *ṣari'at*. The Emperor patiently waited; therefore, for an opportunity of the kind which fell when Prince Khusrau rebelled against him.

Apart from these arguments there are other arguments available of a more general character grounded in the development of the history of

Moghul imperialism and the political policy of the Moghuls, though that will not be discussed here.

Intelligent students of the history of Moghul imperialism in India know that before Babar the Muslim power in India was specifically sought to be laid and consolidated on the foundations of Islamic *ṣariat* for these Muslim rulers knew of no other political system or philosophy.

With the establishment of the Moghul Empire, however, the situation underwent a change. The trend of this change was quite perceptible from the very beginning. Its aim was to strengthen the roots of the government by modifying the Islamic doctrine that non-Muslim subjects must either submit to the sword or to persuasion to become Muslims or alternatively they must accept a secondary and inferior status as subjects, the status of a *zimmī*.

We see the high water mark of this trend, this movement toward secularism, in the reign of Emperor Akbar. After him this trend suffered a decline till, in the reign of Aurangzeb, it reached its nethermost point.

The political policy of the Moghul state is better understood when viewed as a reflection of this trend.

In the court of the Moghul emperors this trend, this policy, had its strong protagonists and opponents, the Rajputs and the *ulemā*. It was the pre-condition of the Rajput cooperation with and support of the Moghul Empire that the basic policy of the state should not spring from the Islamic *ṣariat* and that it should be essentially tolerant and secular, accommodating both the religions, Hinduism and Islam. This pre-condition is the real progenitor of what we now call Indian nationalism.

Such a government was to be presided over by an emperor of a mixed race, of mixed Rajput and Mongol blood. It was desired that a free and tolerant atmosphere for mutual cooperation and assimilation of Islamic and Hindu cultures should thus be created without subjecting Hindu society and Hindu culture to any abrupt and violent shock such as was implicit in the conquest of Islam. It was hoped that though this may change the face and outline of Hinduism, the soul of Hinduism should, nevertheless, remain intact and uninjured.

No doubt some such ideas animated and inspired men like Raja Man Singh. The mortal enemies of these ideas were called the *ulemā*, who tenaciously held that in this

world as in the next salvation lay in accepting and acting upon the Islamic *shariat* and who believed it to be nothing short of unholy cowardice to make any compromises whatever such as were implicit in the ideas of men like Raja Man Singh.

These two points of view had come into conflict around the throne of the Moghul emperors for two full centuries and Moghul princes such as Dara Shikoh and Khusrau lost their lives because they favoured the first viewpoint. In the end, the second viewpoint gained final ascendancy in the form of Emperor Aurangzeb. The curve of this ascendancy began to develop in the reigns of Jahangir and Shahjehan and, as a consequence, the first viewpoint was gradually pushed to the background.

During this period of conflict between these two ideologies, a third ideology constituting a sort of antithesis of both began to rise and take shape. This was the ideology of *hindutva*. The central point of the *hindutva* ideology was that India was the birthplace and the holyland of Hinduism and that the state of India must always be an instrument for the preservation and propagation of Hindu culture and religion. The most fearless exponents and protagonists of this ideology were Samrath

Ramdas, Shivaji Maratha and Rana Pratap.

These three ideologies are still alive and quite active in the Pakistanist Muslim League, the Congress and the Hindu Sabha with its stem of Jan Sangh.

What relation has this titanic conflict of ideologies in India with the martyrdom of Guru Arjan?

It is not here possible to answer this question in any great detail supported by arguments and historical facts but, briefly, the thesis is that Guru Nanak was the progenitor of a fourth ideology which he formulated after examining the historical perspectives of the past half a millennium and the prospects of the future millennium. This ideology was to be of a catholic and all-inclusive character, synthesizing certain elements of these three ideologies but rising onto a different and higher plane altogether, thus laying the foundations of a new society, a new culture, accruing a new theory of government to be established in the subcontinent of India. This ideology took the birth in the confluence of the Aryan and the Semitic cultures and was to furnish the guiding principles for a new universal society and a universal state. The basic principles of this ideology were to be derived from the

well-know *triupadeśa* of Guru Nanak:  
*kirt karo, vand chako, nām japo.*

The homeland of this universal society was to be the enlightened conscience of the human race and the holyland of this society was to be the whole earth. Such was the dream Guru Nanak dreamed for the confluence of the Aryan soul and the Semitic soul, into which confluence must flow the historic soul of the whole human race.

For the actualization of this dream all the ten Gurus toiled and suffered and for it Guru Arjan and Guru Tegh Bahadur courted martyrdom. It was for the implementation of this ideal that Guru Gobind Singh initiated the order of the Khalsa and issued the ordinance that the Khalsa "should seek to destroy all that divides the Hindus from the Muslims."

Thus it was laid down that the initiate into the Khalsa order should

under no circumstances accept slavery and subjugation. The initiate should be a rebel or a defender of the Khalsa *rāj* and he should understand the esoteric meaning of the initiation to be that he dedicated his life for the establishment of the Khalsa *rāj* by bearing arms\* and should endeavour to make the political power thus acquired the instrument for the establishment of the universal society.\*\*

Those who have carefully studied the history of northern India in particular, shall have no difficulty in realizing that the protagonists of this fourth ideology vanished from the historical stage in India about one century ago though the principles and the technique, which are accessories of this ideology, have by no means become extinct and recent modern history has seen their acceptance and application in countries

---

\*Prachin Panth Prakash; Rattan Singh Bhangu; 1898; Bikrami (Gurmukhi).

"The Khalsa owes no earthly allegiance.

They are themselves sovereign, *suigeneris*."

"The status of the Khalsa is beyond dispute and declared.

It is distinct from the rest of creation."

"The Khalsa owes allegiance to no mortal.

The Khalsa either rules or fights and dies as a rebel."

\*\*Gurbilas; Bhai Sukha Singh; 1854; Bikrami (Gurmukhi).

"This uniform, including the right to wear arms,

The all-knowing Guru has ordained.

This order is unique and without a historical parallel.

The Guru has established it to be a model for the guidance of mankind."



and by people entirely unconnected with those to whom this ideology was originally taught. These lands and these peoples have discovered the principles and technique of this ideology independently of the teachings of the Gurus and have achieved a considerable measure of success by their acceptance and application, though these peoples have not yet truly understood and appreciated the significance of the *triupadeśa*, without which the acceptance and application of the principles and techniques of this ideology are fraught with the gravest dangers to the welfare and happiness of mankind. This, however, is only a side issue.

This exegesis of the *gurmāt*, the fourth ideology, receives somewhat indirect support from the excerpt of the Tozak reproduced above. Jahangir stated that the imperial command issued was that Guru Arjan should be dealt with in accordance with the "penal laws of the state and the *yasā*." This is the true and correct translation of the concluding line of the excerpt from the Tozak and not, as has invariably been said, "should be tortured to death."

*Siyāsat* is an Arabic word and it means politics or political penalty. *Yasā* is a Mongol word which means

edict, royal command, law, statute. These are the literal meanings of the word *yasā*. But the technical meanings of the word *yasā* are, "the law promulgated by Jenghiz Khan."\*

This is the true and correct meaning of the word *yasā* and when Jahangir ordered that Guru Arjan be handed over to the custody of Murtza Khan, the Garrison Commandant or the *qilādār* of Lahore, the imperial orders were that Guru Arjan should be dealt with in accordance with the law of the *yasā* on account of his political crimes.

What were these political crimes of the Guru? What is this law of the *yasā*? Answers to these questions alone can delineate the true perspective of Guru Arjan's martyrdom.

Jahangir himself tells us in his Tozak what the Guru's political crimes were. In his flight before the pursuing imperial forces, Prince Khusrau halted for a while at Gōindwal and Guru Arjan put a saffron mark on the Prince's forehead as a good omen. Prince Khusrau at this time was a fugitive from the royal anger and the allegation against the Prince was that he had attempted to overthrow his father, Jahangir, and sit on the imperial throne himself.

---

\*Riasanovsky; Fundamental Principles of Mongol Law; pp. 32-33.

This intention on the part of the Prince to depose Jahangir so that he might sit on the imperial throne is in itself a link in the chain of the conflict between the ideologies, the secular and the *śariat*. In this conflict the allies and sympathizers of Prince Khusrau must naturally have been those persons who were either the protagonists of the secular ideology or were the opponents of the *śariat* ideology.

At such a critical and grave moment when Emperor Jahangir was pursuing the fugitive Prince Khusrau, who could he be who would openly welcome the fugitive Prince as a guest, whose hospitality the Prince would accept and whose good wishes and prayers he would solicit? Such a person must be one whose strong sympathies in this conflict would be clear and fearless, about whom there would be no doubt that he was an opponent of the doctrine on which Emperor Jahangir was determined to base his polity and government policy. Such a person could only be one who had the moral courage to make his opposition to such a doctrine known and who would not be afraid to take the consequences of the royal displeasure. An ordinary person, though he might be opposed to the state policy of Jahangir, could not be

chosen or accepted as a host by Prince Khusrau at such a critical moment as this.

No Sikh writer has denied that at this time, when the Prince was fleeing as a fugitive before the angry royal hosts, he stayed for a while at Goindwal and there enjoyed the hospitality of Guru Arjan. Sikh historians and writers endeavour to show that the Prince and his followers were hungry and that they ate their meals at the community kitchen of the Guru. They are anxious to say that the Guru had nothing whatever to do, directly or indirectly, with the predicament in which Prince Khusrau found himself.

Such a thesis is difficult to accept when the whole matter is carefully considered. In the first place, to offer food and succour to a rebel against the imperial throne was in itself clearly tantamount to abetting high treason. Second, the story about the saffron mark does not fit in with the thesis which the Sikh writers want accepted unless it is concluded that the whole of it is fictitious.

But what possible advantage could Jahangir or the opponents of the Guru derive by inventing such a wholly fictitious story? To feed and to succour a rebel against the imperial throne was itself a crime sufficiently

serious to exact the extreme penalty of the law and the story of the saffron mark could hardly add to its gravity.

The conclusion, therefore, seems inevitable that Prince Khusrau was well aware that Guru Arjan was a fearless and uncompromising opponent of the policy of Jahangir by which the Emperor had made the law of *śariat* the foundation of his government and that Guru Arjan was such a towering personality and of such high moral courage that he would not fear or flinch from receiving and offering comfort to the Prince who was fleeing before the royal host, which was at his very heels.

Then remains the story of the saffron mark. It seems quite probable that the Prince, in accordance with the etiquette required at the Guru's court, made some offering as a mark of respect and love and the master of ceremonies, the *ardāsīyā*, put a saffron mark on the Prince's forehead as a token of the acceptance of his offering. Such was the custom prevailing then in the Guru's court just as, subsequently, at the time of Guru Gobind Singh, the custom became prevalent of conferring a robe of honour, a *saropā*, on such occasions.

It must always be remembered that the Guru was arrested by the

direct orders of the Emperor and that the Guru at no time denied that he comforted and offered his hospitality to the fugitive Prince. All the Guru did in his defence was to decline to pay the huge fine imposed upon him, although the amount of this fine was not beyond his financial means, and the Guru, before he took leave of his son, Guru Har Gobind, left clear and final instructions that the succeeding Guru should organize and consolidate a militia, well equipped and well armed.

Guru Arjan's conduct makes it inevitably clear that it was neither his policy nor intention to sit on the fence while momentous issues were awaiting decision in the political arena of India and while the whole future of the Hindu race was in the melting pot. Indeed, such an attitude was a necessary corollary of Guru Nanak's *triupadesa*.

What was the *yasā*? Jenghiz Khan, whose real name was Temchun, was the chief of a Mongol tribe. By and by he subjugated the neighbouring tribes of the Mongol nomads and eventually became the supreme head of the Mongols and Tartars and assumed the title of *khāqān*. He was born in 1162 A.D. and he died in 1227. He was one of the world's greatest conquerors and before he died he

had conquered an empire, one frontier of which touched the China Sea; another the Russian river Dnieper; the third frontier, the river Indus; and the fourth, the Ural Mountains of Europe.

This Jenghiz Khan codified his Compendium of State Laws in 1206 A.D. and in 1218 he promulgated this code throughout his empire. The code's contents were derived from the ancient customs of the Mongol tribes and the ancient royal statutes of the Chinese. The collection of the sayings of Jenghis Khan is known by the name of the Bilik\* and his code of laws is known as the *yasā*. Only sparse fragments of the Bilik and the *yasā* are now available.

In the Bilik, Jenghiz Khan is reported to have said about the *yasā*: "If those who follow me as the government functionaries, the chiefs or the *sardārs*, transgress the laws of the *yasā*, ever so slightly, there will be chaos in the empire and its foundations will become shaky. Then they will search for Jenghiz Khan but shall not find him."\*\*

The Arabic historian Makrizi said, "When the Mongols accepted Islam,

they changed the *shariat* in accordance with their tribal customs. In purely religious matters they consult the chief *qādī* but for domestic matters concerning their individual rights or tribal welfare they accept only the *yasā* of Jenghiz Khan and for this purpose they appoint a separate officer."\*\*\*

When Jenghiz Khan defeated and hunted out the Mohammadan king, Khwarzim Shah, alias Mohammad Shah, from Sistan and Kabul and pursued him up to the banks of the Indus, the father of the Indian poet Amir Khisru was in the retinue of the Muslim king. This Amir Khisru later became a courtier of Sultan Ghiath-ud-Din Balban at Delhi. This Sultan ruled between 1266 and 1287 A. D.

Amir Khisru recorded that "the eyes of the Mongols are so small and fierce that they can pierce through a copper vessel. Their complexion is so repulsive that only the foul smell of their bodies excels it. Their heads are fixed on their shoulders and they have no necks. Their cheeks resemble dried leather bottles. Their noses are broad and snub and their nostrils like

\*Fundamental Principles of Mongol Law; pp. 27-29; by Riasanovisky.

The Scope and Contents of Chingiz Khan's *Yasa*; by Vernatsky.

Journal of Harvard Asiatic Studies; pp. 337, 360; 1938.

\*\*The Life of Chingiz Khan; p. 77; by Vladimirtsov.

\*\*\*Crusaders in the East; p. 334; by W. B. Steveson.



old, dilapidated graves.....Their bodies are alive with lice and their skin is like the thick cowhide suitable for making shoes. When the Sultan beheld them he said, 'Verily these creatures are born out of the fire of hell.'.....As awful as is their appearance, so are their laws which are called the *yasā*."\*

Before they accepted Islam the Mongols were the followers of shaman religion, the animistic beliefs still prevalent in some parts of Siberia. The shaman religion inculcates the worship of ghosts, trees and the sky. Its priests are called *bikki*.\*\*

The belief of the Mongols was that after their death these priests, the *bikkis*, became ghosts capable of protecting or harming the Mongol tribes. If the blood was shed of any *bikki* it was believed that his ghost could and would do grave injury to the Mongol tribes.

Two incidents are recorded, one in the case of Jenghiz Khan and the

other in the case of one of his generals, Mukhali, when it became necessary to impose the punishment of death on a *bikki*. In one case the *bikki* was put to death by being boiled alive and in the other case his hands and feet were tied and then he was thrown into the mid current of a river. The idea was to kill these *bikkis* without shedding their blood so that their ghosts could not return to cause grave injury to the Mongol tribes.\*\*\*

There is no doubt it was a law of the *yasā* that religious priests and persons of exalted spiritual status should not be put to death in any way which caused the shedding of their blood. If it ever became imperative that a *bikki*, or a person with the status of a *bikki*, must be put to death for reasons of such grave political character that the issues involved were the very safety and existence of the state, then the death of such a *bikki* had to be caused without shedding his blood.

---

\*Cambridge History of India; Volume III; p. 84.

\*\*It may be that this *bikki* is the same as the Buddhist *bhikkhu*. It is certain that by the 12th century Mahayana Buddhism had infiltrated into Mongolia for Kublai Khan had actually by then commissioned his *gurū*, Dro-gon, a Tibetan *lāmā*, to preach Buddhism to the masses of Mongolia and we have it on the authority of the Dutch missionary Ruburquis that by the middle of the 13th century Mahayana Buddhism was flourishing in Inner Mongolia. In that case, the Mongol word *bikki* is the Pali word *bhikkhu*, which is the Sanskrit word, *bhiksū*, literally, one who subsists on alms. *Bikki* therefore means a holy man, a saint.

\*\*\*A Short History of Chinese Civilization; London; 1942; pp. 68, 213; by Tsuichi.

The Medieval Christian custom of burning heretics at the stake and the Anglo-Saxon custom of inflicting death on criminals by hanging, are traceable to the same general belief and is one of the commandments of the Mosaic law: "Thou shalt not shed blood."

In the light of these facts it is clear that the punishment which Emperor Jahangir ordered inflicted on Guru Arjan in accordance with the laws of the *yasā* was of two grounds: One, that the crimes of

Guru Arjan were of such grave and political nature that the Guru's existence was definitely considered a danger to the safety of the Moghul Empire in India, and, two that the spiritual status of Guru Arjan was considered so exalted as to make it necessary for him to be put to death by being boiled alive in water.

This is the true significance and meaning of the imperial order that the Guru be dealt with "*ba-siyāsat va ba-yasā*."

# ELMAC

FUDGE, JUJUBES, NUTCRUNCH, BUTTER-SCOTCH, ASSORTED CHOCOLATES,  
MARSHMALLOWS, CANNED PORK VINDALOO, SAUSAGES,  
CHICKEN CURRY, CANNED MANGO SLICES, PEACHES,  
SLICED PINEAPPLE, GUAVA JELLY, JAMS, VINEGAR,  
SAUCES, PICKLES, PEAS.

13 MARSDEN STREET, CALCUTTA-16